**RESPONSE TO THE REVIEWER FOR THE PAPER:**

**How do people understand inequality in Chile? A study of attitudes through network analysis.**

This document provides answers to the critiques raised by reviewer A. We thank the reviewer for his/her effort, and we show that we welcomed almost all his/her remarks. Since the reviewer organized his document by sections, we stick to this organization in the present text. In this file, the original **critiques** are reported in **plain** text, and our **answers** are highlighted in **yellow**. This mirrors the color scheme adopted in the revised manuscript, where we highlighted in yellow the new parts, and use plain text for the unchanged sections.

# Introduction

* + Is this the only reason why the authors use the case of Chile? “We analyze 2019 ISSP Social Inequality Module data from Chile, since this country is one of the most unequal in the world.” I imagine that there are more unequal countries in the ISSP, and that Chile may be interesting not only for its inequality but also for its high segregation, welfare model, etc., all of which can affect attitudes.

We thank the reviewer for this comment, and we elaborate more on case selection in paragraph 1 of the Introduction.

* + It seems to me that the introduction provides a good idea of the article’s contribution; however, it requires further problematization. In its current state, the introduction is very minimalist. On one hand, I think the authors could briefly mention what previous research has done on attitudes towards inequality. In fact, there is a vast literature on class divisions in political attitudes. I imagine that several authors have already mentioned the importance of networks in understanding political attitudes in general. From there, it can be indicated that (i) attitudes towards inequality “are usually not studied simultaneously (Janmaat, 2013)”, (ii) and a network perspective, in general, has not been widely used to understand attitudes towards inequality within this literature, especially not from the perspective suggested by the authors. I suggest reviewing the following references that could be useful in providing more content to the introduction:

Lindh, A., & McCall, L. (2020). Class position and political opinion in rich democracies. Annual Review of Sociology, 46, 419-441.

Lindh, A., Andersson, A. B., & Volker, B. (2021). The missing link: network influences on class divides in political attitudes. European Sociological Review, 37(5), 695-712. –

We expanded the Introduction by creating the second paragraph. This presents more context antecedent to our work, also discussing the suggested references.

- The following paragraph in the theory could be better placed in the introduction as it substantiates the research gap identified by the authors (attitudes towards inequality are usually not studied simultaneously): “Although Janmaat’s work is limited to measurements exclusively on economic inequality, the evidence shows that subjective evaluations on redistribution, taxation and wages, are essential to comprehend how people understand the distribution of resources. It has been shown in a variety of contexts that beliefs about redistribution are closely related to people’s perceptions of inequality (Choi, 2021; Fatke, 2018; García-Sánchez et al., 2020). Also, several studies have focused on people’s preferences regarding taxation and their concerns about reducing inequalities (Alm & Torgler, 2006; Barnes, 2015; Franko et al., 2013). In the same vein, research on perceptions and beliefs regarding the magnitude and principles governing wage allocation constitute an important subfield in the study of inequality (Castillo, 2009; Evans et al., 2010; Frank et al., 2015; Osberg & Smeeding, 2006)”. –

This paragraph is now part of the Introduction (paragraph 2) as suggested by the reviewer.

- The following paragraph in the theory could also be placed in the introduction. It emphasizes the necessity of conducting research on attitudes towards inequality in Latin America:

“Research on attitudes towards inequality has mainly been conducted, paradoxically, in developed countries with lower levels of disparities in the distribution of resources. However, in recent years a significant amount of academic work has focused on understanding how people address inequality within Latin America, one of the regions with the highest inequality indexes in the world (Keeley, 2015). This literature has allowed us to understand the local particularities of the phenomenon and how various evidence in developed nations holds or not to the Latin American context”.

We welcome this suggestion by merging this paragraph in the Introduction section (paragraph 1).

# Theory

* + I suggest that the authors avoid discussing research gaps in this section. It would be more suitable to include them in the introduction, where the antecedents and research problem should be outlined.

The Theory section does not discuss the theory gap anymore, since that role is now covered by the extended Introduction, as reported in the previous section of this file.

* + The following text is interesting but should be placed in a separate paragraph: “However, other research destabilise the link between status positions and attitudes towards inequality, highlighting the importance of cultural norms and normative values that go beyond mere self-interest (Etzioni, 1988; Feldman & Zaller, 1992)). Indeed, it has found that unlike in European countries (Schmidt-Catran, 2016) in Latin America support for attitudes such as public redistribution are not primarily determined by the objective socioeconomic position of individuals (Berens, 2015; Franetovic & Castillo, 2021), questioning the applicability and universality of a self-interest approach, grounded in a utility-oriented social actor (Franko et al., 2013; Meltzer & Richard, 1981; Wegener & Liebig, 1995)”.

We agree with the reviewer, and we separated the paragraphs he/she mentioned in this comment.

* + Additionally, before suggesting that economic interest can be questioned as an explanation for attitudinal differences according to SES, it would be helpful to indicate that economic interest has been proposed as a primary mechanism to explain the class divide in attitudes. After all, class-based differences in attitudes towards inequality can be explained using other mechanisms such as class identity, job autonomy, and deprivation.

Before discussing the (more recent) contributions questioning the impact of economic interest on attitude towards inequality and redistribution, we now specify that that was the mainstream paradigm of research.

* + I think that is complicated to compare objective and subjective aspects. On one hand, factors such as education, social class, and income may have similar effects on attitudes towards inequality, although they may vary depending on the outcomes. It is also possible that education and income mediate the effects of social class on attitudes. More critically, although it is true that, for example, subjective status, the perception of tax regressivity, and the belief in its progressivity can be significantly associated with the perception of inequality and the belief in public redistribution, they are generally generated by socioeconomic characteristics in the first place. Thus, they probably mediate more than eliminate the class divide on attitudes.

We are concerned by the phenomena mentioned by the reviewer. Therefore, we decided to dedicate more space to this point, excluding it from the Theory Section. We now discuss this problem in the extended Conclusions (where we merged our previous Discussion and Conclusion sections, according to another comment of the reviewer which is discussed later in this file).

* + In the “attitude network” section, I suggest that the authors shift their focus towards presenting arguments that generate testable expectations rather than solely describing the methodology they will employ. While methodological descriptions are valuable, they could be better placed in the methods section. Instead, it would be beneficial to elaborate on the potential insights that attitude networks can provide. What general patterns and specific phenomena can we anticipate observing? And how might these expectations be influenced by the particular context of Chile? Moreover, since the authors will be comparing attitude networks across socioeconomic variables, it is important to theorize and anticipate the differences that may arise in attitude networks according to socioeconomic factors in particular.

We transformed the attitude network section (Section 2.2) by adding research Hypotheses. We now present only the theoretical contributions which are essential to support our claims. This section is now divided into three subparagraphs where we clarify why: (H1) we expect a fully connected network; (H2) we expect structural differences between the attitude networks of low versus high social status groups; (H3) we anticipate we will find more communities in the networks of the low social status groups.

Moreover, the reviewer asked to formulate a hypothesis regarding the precise structural differences we will find in the Results section. **We welcome this critique only partially**. Indeed, we now state we expect differences in node centrality and connectivity (H2), and also in the number of communities (H3). However, we do not feel we have the theoretical basis for specifying hypotheses regarding more precise differences (*e.g.:* we do not have a hypothesis declaring we expect a certain node to be more central in one of the networks, nor do we have one stating that a certain edge will be stronger in an attitude network). We agree with the reviewer in that this would be important, but we want to highlight that this contribution represents the first work addressing the structure, rather than the levels, of attitude towards inequality. This entails that we can not rely on other works studying the structure of this attitude anywhere in the world. Including more precise hypotheses in such an exploratory and groundbreaking contribution would enhance the risk of merely stating the hypotheses we saw to be confirmed by our results. We would like to avoid such a bad scientific practice.

# Data and variables

* + I suggest that the authors separate the description of the data and variables.

We separated these sections, by creating a new paragraph for the selected variables (3.2). Also, we slightly modify the method section to state how we are going to test the hypotheses introduced in Section 4.3. Within the Method section, changes occurred only in Section 3.3, where some sentences changed (highlighted in yellow) and some others did not, but were moved to different positions of the paragraph to improve readability (not highlighted, since unchanged).

# Results

* + The results are very interesting and well presented!

We are happy that the reviewer enjoyed this section. Here we added a few words to clarify when the hypotheses were confirmed.

# Discussion and conclusions

* + I suggest merging the discussion and conclusion sections.

We merged the discussion and conclusion: now we only have the section “5 Discussion”. While merging we decided to move some sentences in other positions. We only highlighted sentences that changed, whereas those which simply moved are reported in plain text. Please note that this section now contains the discussion of an additional limitation, which is the one isolated by the reviewer and commented on above in this file.

* + I think it is not necessary to include the node labels in this section.

We removed node labels in parentheses from the Conclusion section. We kept node labels only when they are part of a sentence.

* + I would encourage the authors to compare their results with evidence reported in prior studies, especially regarding variations in attitude networks by structural or socioeconomic factors.

We now compare our results with the attitude network literature in three key points. First, we compare our findings to those obtained by one study on attitudes towards post-national citizenship. We argue that, although our paper and theirs find structural differences in attitude networks of people with different socioeconomic conditions, their unstructured comparison makes it hard to directly compare our results. Second, we engage with other papers which reported the small-world index of attitude networks. Third, we argue that since (1) connectivity of networks estimated on the lower samples is always higher and (2) ASPL predicts attitude strength (Dalege et al., 2019), then: we can give to the literature a hypothesis to be tested: whether people in lower socio-economic positions have higher attitude strength for attitudes towards inequality.